INTRODUCTION

Lisa Kemmerer

Long after my last grade school dot-to-dot puzzle, in a classic "ah-hah!" moment, I connected those very visual little black dots on paper with the idea of "connecting the dots." Much later, I pondered how hard it would be, were I no bigger than a gnat, to connect those many little black dots—especially if they were on a multi-dimensional plane. What if a gnat-sized human were trying to connect figurative dots, and those dots were partially or wholly obscured (by social conventions)? This seems to be our predicament, and our task is to connect the otherwise seemingly disparate aspects (dots) that form our lives. If we are able to do so, we gain a richer and fuller understanding of existence—of life and our place in the universe. This is exactly what ecofeminists have set out to do.

In the last third of the twentieth century, ecofeminists exposed various connections between different forms of oppression, more precisely between sexism and environmental degradation. Eventually, ecofeminists also linked poverty, racism, and animal exploitation with environmental problems. Indeed, these thinkers and writers have demonstrated that we must simultaneously work against poverty, racism, environmental degradation, sexism, speciesism, and homophobia, because all are connected. Social justice is only possible if we understand connections between various forms of oppression. We have little hope of putting an end to racism or homophobia (or even understanding them) if we fail to recognize how these harmful oppressions are connected. Social justice requires that we dismantle *systems of oppression* undergirding a plethora of "isms." It is hard work to ferret out forces that have been purposefully obscured behind common, everyday aspects of our lives and our communities, but ecofeminist writings explain why we must connect the dots of oppression, and attack all of them simultaneously to liberate and protect, among other things, animals and our much-beleaguered earth.

Philosophical and Practical Differences

Environmentalists and animal activists are often keenly aware of philosophical and practical differences played out in the arenas of animal and earth advocacy—including different points of focus and distinct goals that are likely approached via contrasting methods. Perhaps most noticeably, environmentalists strive to preserve species and ecosystems, focusing their energy on *wild* flora and fauna while ignoring (sometimes despising) domestic animals. Environmentalists tend to willingly protect endangered species at the expense of individuals from more plentiful species—including domestic animals. They sometimes even resort to killing plentiful species, invasive species, and domestic animals (burros and cats and pigs) on behalf of fragile ecosystems and/or endangered species. Conversely, animal activists tend to value the individual, viewing every life as precious, and generally value the preservation of individuals—whether labeled domestic or invasive—over the preservation of ecosystems.

These philosophical differences are often reflected in lifestyle choices, especially consumer choices. Serious environmentalists are likely to shop with cloth bags, select organic or local foods, cycle or walk when possible, use fluorescent bulbs, recycle almost all "garbage," and lobby against environmentally destructive products such as palm oil and genetically modified foods. Meanwhile, these same earth activists might buy leather, defend and/or align with hunters and hunting, accept animal experimentation, and frequent zoos or aquariums. Environmentalists are more likely than animal activists to purchase (rather than adopt) companion animals, and may or may not be committed to spay/neuter.

In contrast, serious animal advocates are less likely to shop organic, carry cloth bags, cycle or recycle, or be concerned about palm oil and other environmentally damaging products. Animal advocates are more apt to allow a beloved, adopted, spayed/neutered companion dog or cat to run free, viewing this as essential to their dog or cat's happiness. They are less likely to drive small cars, and more likely to lobby against the use of animals in science and for entertainment or education, including their exploitation in aquariums and zoos. Serious animal advocates generally tend toward a vegan lifestyle, avoiding animal products such as leather, flesh, eggs, and dairy.

But once the figurative dots have been connected, these consumer/lifestyle differences become unreasonable: Earth and animal activists, if serious about their cause, must adopt many of the lifestyle/consumer choices of the "other" camp. Environmentalists might become aware that leather processing and hunting policies are extremely damaging to ecosystems. Animal experimentation, when practiced on certain species, depletes and endangers wildlife and ecosystems because animals such as frogs and primates are snatched from the wild for laboratory use. Zoos, aquariums, and trade in "exotic pets" also effect ecosystems, and damage and destroy native populations when animals such as primates and cetaceans are taken from the wild. While spay/neuter is considered an animal activist's cause, unaltered dogs and cats contribute to domestic overpopulations that destroy wildlife and damage local ecosystems. Animal agriculture causes more environmental damage

than any other industry—it makes absolutely no sense for environmentalists to hate bovines with hamburger in hand.

Similarly, animal advocates need to rethink how they choose to live—especially consumer choices. Plastic bags and large cars use petroleum and pollute, packaging requires water and destroys trees, plastics clog oceans, palm oil takes out rainforests, and incandescent light bulbs require more energy. With regard to energy use, animal advocates ought to strive to reduce consumption to prevent the damming of even one more river where herons and kingfishers hunt, the building of windmills on even one more prairie where bats and birds fly, the leveling of even one more forest where deer or orangutans dwell. All creatures depend on their particular environment—undammed rivers, intact forests, uncluttered oceans, and stable temperatures—in order to survive, and therefore animal advocates ought to be environmentally conscious on behalf of nonhuman animals. Additionally, those who are concerned about the lives or suffering of rabbits, deer, song birds, mice, moles, and small lizards and snakes, will keep dogs and cats indoors and/or on leashes to make sure they do not harass or harm wildlife.

Despite the vital importance of both earth and animal advocacy, philosophers (particularly in environmental ethics) have actively bolstered a divide between the two. A great deal of philosophical energy has been directed toward differences, emphasizing questions such as:

- What is the proper focus of moral attention, species or the individual?
- What is rightly viewed as "natural"?
- Which aspects or elements of the natural environment are morally considerable, and why? (Are streams and soils morally considerable? What about plants, feral cats, invasive species, and farmed animals?)
- Where—and why—might we draw a line between morally considerable and non-morally considerable individuals, species, and/or aspects of the natural world? (Is sentience essential for moral considerability? Which beings are sentient? Is sentience a matter of degree, or an all-or-nothing phenomenon?)

As the first example aptly demonstrates, these questions build an armory of difference around two presumably mutually exclusive possibilities. A more reasonable approach would assume a middle ground and strive for balance, a measure of synthesis and integration. Each of these philosophical concerns seeks to exclude, inquiring as to what might be placed outside a particular construct, such as "natural" or "sentient." Environmentalists, who tend to focus moral attention specifically on the natural world, thereby exclude certain species (such as farmed animals) and geographical areas (such as cities) from their moral sphere. If domestic chickens are deemed unnatural, for example, they are of no concern to environmentalists—except inasmuch as they harm the "natural" environment. Meanwhile, animal advocates often focus on sentience, neglecting vital habitat and sometimes bogging down on discussions of ants and microbes that do nothing to improve the plight of cattle or elephants, or protect vital habitats such as the ocean or rainforest.

Case Studies

Different foci, goals, and methods are perhaps most evident in real-life scenarios. The following two cases (ongoing in Texas and Oregon) exemplify philosophical differences expressed in divergent concerns and conflicting approaches.

Big Bend Ranch State Park, Texas

Animal and earth advocates are butting heads over burros on 316,000 acres near the Rio Grande. Abandoned by Texas ranchers long ago, donkeys have become part of the landscape, wandering in and out of Big Bend Ranch State Park at will. Those focused on ecosystems accuse feral burros of fouling the park's precious springs and creeks with manure and urine, disrupting local native food chains, and competing with endemic species—some of which are endangered—for scarce water and fodder (Texas Parks and Wildlife, n.d.).

Texas Parks and Wildlife tried unsuccessfully to trap and relocate the burros, so they drew their guns in 2007, killing 71 burros before the public caught wind of the slaughter (Humane Society of the United States, 2012). Texas Parks and Wildlife then turned to a California NGO, Peaceful Valley Donkey Rescue, but not even one burro was relocated two years later. In 2010 Texas Parks and Wildlife again resorted to high-powered weapons, killing 59 burros and igniting a public relations wildfire.

In the eyes of some, including The Wild Burro Protection League, wild burros ought to be protected because they are a "heritage species," a beast of burden that played a critical role in settling the area (Scharrer, 2012). Feral burros are protected in nearby Big Bend National Park "by a 40-year-old federal ban" preventing anyone from harming "living symbols and pioneer spirit of the West" (Blaney, 2012). Those concerned about the burros note that they are peaceful, largely defenseless herbivores, that they fertilize the landscape and keep the area free of dead-wood, reducing fire risks. The controversy was yet more heated when the burro contingent learned that Texas Parks and Wildlife only seeks to eliminate burros in order to bring in bighorn sheep, a big-money, big-game species, but the "Desert Bighorn Council won't release the bighorn while burros are present" (Jonsson, 2012).

In 2011, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) offered to "devise a nonlethal plan" to extract the remaining 300 burros (Blaney, 2012). It remains to be seen if/how HSUS will remove and rehome 300 burros ... and somehow prevent other burros from wandering into Big Bend Ranch State Park. Until such a time, those concerned about Big Bend ecosystems and those concerned about local burros remain decidedly at odds.

Fishing Interests in Oregon

The Columbia River was once rich with salmon (Chinook, Coho, sockeye, chum, pink) and steelhead trout (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, n.d.). When Europeans first arrived in Oregon, 10 to 16 million "salmon and steelhead returned to the

river each year to spawn" (Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008). Settlers in the late nineteenth century noted that fishing interests in the region were "beyond calculation," offering an "almost inexhaustible" supply of fish (Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008).

A century later, overfishing and habitat destruction (dams, pollution, etc.) have reduced Columbia River fish runs by as much as 14 million fish per year (Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, n.d.). In the Northwest and California, 214 (of about 400) subpopulations of salmon, steelhead, and cutthroat trout "are at risk of extinction," while 106 subpopulations "are already extinct" (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, n.d.; Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008). Pink salmon have been extirpated from the Columbia River, and each remaining salmon species is listed as Threatened—except sockeye, listed as Endangered (Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008; Specie, n.d.). We have become so used to the terms "Threatened" and "Endangered" that we perhaps fail to grasp their meaning: Endangered means "likely to become extinct"; Threatened means "likely to become Endangered in the near future" (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, n.d.).

In the proper season, beleaguered fish populations battle their way up the Columbia to spawn, but 150 miles up the Columbia, the Bonneville Dam turns fish into easy prey for sea lions (Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008). Not to be out-maneuvered when it comes to fishing interests, the Army Corps of Engineers stationed:

> observers with spotting scopes along the deck of Bonneville Dam to record the number of salmon and steelhead consumed by sea lions between January and May when ESA [Endangered Species Act]-listed runs are present. In 2002, they observed 31 sea lions consume 448 salmon and steelhead. In 2008, observers reported that 103 sea lions ate more than 4,243 salmon and steelhead in the same limited area below the dam. Another estimate, based on California sea lions' metabolic needs, suggests that 100 animals feeding in that area consume at least 13,000 salmon each spring.
>
> (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, n.d.).

Funding was quickly provided to protect Threatened/Endangered fish from sharp-toothed sea lions. Washington and Oregon Fish and Wildlife Services (FWS):

> each received an annual grant of $150,000 from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission to support hazing and sea lion removal below Bonneville Dam. Each state agency ... also contributed approximately $15,000 for early-season hazing efforts designed to protect sturgeon in the same area. The Army Corps of Engineers provides approximately $150,000 per year to document predation, haze sea lions and conduct fieldwork related to sea lion predation. The Corps also invested more than $3 million to install heavy bars and sonic devices to keep sea lions out of fishways and ladders at Bonneville Dam.
>
> (Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008)

Washington FWS promptly shot 40 California sea lions, but these were quickly replaced by other sea lions coming to feed—40 dead sea lions and no fewer fish-eaters below the Bonneville Dam. There was, however, one noticeable difference—an increased density of protected Steller sea lions. Like salmon below the Bonneville Dam, Steller sea lions are listed as Threatened (and are thereby protected) and must be left to gobble up fish, even Threatened/Endangered salmon beneath the Bonneville Dam.

Those concerned about sea lions requested relocation, but relocated sea lions quickly returned to the rich source of sustenance below the Bonneville Dam. To date, there has been "[n]o halt to sea lion killing" (Daily World, 2012). In fact, there has been no halt to *any* killing: People, sea lions, and salmon continue to congregate carnivorously on the Columbia River.

Connecting the Dots: Common Ground, Joint Action

Burros at Big Bend and sea lions at Bonneville Dam exemplify a different focus and distinct goals, addressed with contrasting methods, between environmentalists and animal activists: Environmentalists seek to protect ecosystems and endangered species, and are generally willing to kill non-endangered individuals in the process—especially domesticated animals, feral domestics, non-native, or "invasive" species. Animal advocates seek to protect every individual—even those who consume Threatened/Endangered species. While environmentalists are eager to include streams and valleys and endangered species in our moral landscape, animal activists are more interested in protecting cattle and cats and burros and seals.

Despite core differences, which have received more than their share of attention, environmentalists and animal advocates have much in common. Most critically, both groups share an interest in expanding our moral circle (Noske, 2007). Animal activists and environmentalists share a fundamental, core interest that shapes both camps, and which ought to draw them together toward shared goals. The desire to eradicate anthropomorphism/speciesism/humano-centrism constitutes critical common ground: "The environmental movement and the animal protection movement are at the very least cousins and, even more important, natural allies" (Waldau, 2011: 122). Habitat is another plot of prime realty shared by both groups, though frequently obfuscated by our dualistic urge to separate "animal" from "environment." In truth, all beings are utterly dependent on their environment such that it makes no sense to view individuals as divorced from their essential surroundings. "Environmentalists have obvious allies in advocates of ... animal rights" (Sagoff, 2012: 308).

In light of these vital points of alliance, joint action makes sense, and offers many advantages, most notably people-power. More activists bring more ideas, more skills, more financial backing, and more boots on the ground for outreach, education, and hands-on projects. A larger group is also more apt to influence legislators—when advocating for change in a democracy, numbers count.

Working together also provides the advantage of cross-fertilization, likely improving both camps. Earth and animal activists will be encouraged to realign behaviors (especially consumption patterns) with core commitments: environmentalists will be encouraged to shift to a plant based diet; animal advocates will find incentive to shop organic and seek products with less packaging, cloth bags in hand.

Common Ground Practical Application: Bonneville Dam

With regard to fish and sea lions below the Bonneville Dam, what shape might joint action take? Would environmentalists and animal advocates seek nonlethal means of protecting salmon from the sea lions? Might we find ways to reduce energy consumption so that the dam could be dismantled? Is there some more fundamental cause of the problem that we have overlooked? With regard to the Bonneville Dam, environmentalists are concerned about Threatened/Endangered fish populations; the root concern for animal advocates is the protection of sea lions—what constitutes the most likely shared plot of ground?

Root causes are usually a good place to look for common ground. The root cause of both concerns (Threatened/Endangered salmon and the shooting of sea lions) is human consumption of fish from the Columbia River. Sea lions are innocent—they can't choose veggie stir fry; they *must* eat fish to survive, and they have no way of knowing that (thanks to humans) certain fish are Threatened/Endangered. While sea lion fish consumption in the region is natural and essential for sea lion survival, such consumption is entirely unnecessary for human health and welfare. Human fish consumption and resultant commercial fishing operations are the root cause of salmon and steelhead depletion in the Columbia River—and around the world. On what reasonable grounds would sincere, informed environmentalists or animal advocates refuse to join forces in a campaign to protect Threatened fish from the snapping teeth of humanity?

The most viable solution to the problem of Threatened/Endangered fish and sea lions at the Bonneville Dam is for human beings to:

- stop eating Threatened/Endangered fish—and stop consuming fish more generally inasmuch as our voracious consumption of fish damages ecosystems, depletes sea life, and destroys individual fish (see Chapter 10);
- encourage others to protect fish through alternative food choices via education and outreach;
- lobby against fishing industries and practices that harm Threatened/Endangered fish (and other sea life).

Changing our diet is less costly than shooting sea lions, and a much more effective way to solve the Bonneville Dam problem. It is also the responsible and honest approach—sea lions are not the problem, we are.

Is there a similar core problem that undergirds the conflict over burros and ecosystems at Big Bend Ranch State Park?

Animals and Environment: Common Ground

In a world with so many desperate problems facing nonhuman animals and the environment, and also because systems of oppression link animal exploitation and environmental degradation, it is ineffective to ask, "Who is right?" and "Where can we draw lines?" We would be much more successful if we would ask, "How can we work together?" Earth and animal activists have much to gain by cooperating, and much to learn from one another. Moreover, fragmentation and division between social justice activists only serves to help mutual adversaries—there *are* enemies in this battle (such as unscrupulous large corporations), but earth and animal activists are not enemies because they share core common concerns and very fundamental goals.

Bearing this in mind, essays in this anthology highlight common ground between earth and animal advocates. Authors in Malaysia, Greece, Canada, Norway, Uganda, and The United States—including Native American, Chicana Indigenae, and Indian-American voices—unveil the interconnections between earth and animal activism, and demonstrate how activists from both camps might work together to protect earth and nonhuman animals—and why it makes perfect sense to do so. Meanwhile, each section begins with a poem that invites readers to ponder our effect on and place in the universe.

Part I: Establishing and Exploring Common Ground

Section I. Foundations: Theoretical Connections

Foundations and frameworks are critical for activists, most notably because we are often called to provide *reasons* for our commitments and our actions. Reasons generally require activists to articulate motivations and larger purposes. Part I, Section I investigates and elucidates foundations and frameworks that support and validate earth and animal activism as a single cause.

In the first essay of Section I, Carol Glasser makes a case for total liberation, exploring systems of oppression that affect the natural world, nonhuman animals, and disempowered human beings. Carrie Freeman places animal advocacy front and center not only for environmental activism, but for all social justice movements. Josephine Donovan explores ecofeminism and an ethic of care rooted in respect, responsibility and attentiveness. The final essay of the first section turns attention to religion—the oldest, most pervasive foundation and framework connecting earth and animal activism.

Section II. Common Ground: Wildlife and Wilderness

Sections II and III focus on the most obvious contemporary issues common to earth and animal advocates: ecosystems/habitat and diet. Section II explores vital connections between wildlife and wilderness. Most fundamentally, all creatures depend on habitat such that the two cannot reasonably be considered independently. In the

first essay of Section II, I debunk a handful of misconceptions and myths surrounding sport hunting, highlight the damaging effects that hunting and hunting policies have on wildlife and ecosystems. Valarie Chalcraft explores the cycle of misery and violence affecting both elephants and humans, paying particular attention to forces that threaten Asian elephants. Anja Heister and I exposè the ecologically disruptive effects of Montana's government-run Furbearer Trapping Program, designed by and for trappers. Melanie Martin investigates how patriarchal nature films affect our understanding of and encounters with wilderness and wildlife, including feminization of land and masculinization of animals and scientific "facts" that diminish and objectify nonhuman animals.

Section III. Common Ground: Dietary Choice

Essays in Section III focus on dietary choice and environmental degradation exposing the intimate connections between the two. In the first essay, John Halley uses a mathematical model to calculate the ecological footprint of several dietary options: omnivore, vegetarian, and vegan. Next, Bethany Dopp and I investigate the effects of industrial fishing on sealife, ocean habitat, and ocean ecosystems. The final two essays examine animal agriculture: Chris Hunt describes both the inherent cruelty of factory farms and how animal agriculture pollutes air and water—causing sexless fish, acid rain, and climate change; I expose connections between animal agriculture and freshwater depletion, deforestation, soil degradation, wildlife, and land use.

IV. Common Ground: Raising Questions, Pondering Connections

This group of essays explores conflicts and connections between earth and animal activists, offering more questions than answers (because there *are* more questions than answers). Wilderness advocate Randall Gloege presents animal advocate criticisms of environmentalists, and poses three fundamental questions regarding the nature of humanity, each central to our relationship with animals and the natural world. Jon Swenson, head of the Scandinavian Brown Bear Research Project, describes his scientific, utilitarian approach, and how this places him at odds with animal activists. In the process, he ponders a handful of questions that lie at the heart of the historic divide between animal and earth activists. Environmentalist Bernard Quetchenbach takes readers to a spectacular Montana wilderness riddled with dead and dying evergreens—destroyed by climate change and bark beetles—which heightens his awareness of "imbalance" and pushes him to ponder the path less taken. Cara Chamberlain explores and celebrates bison as "scapegoats, martyrs, icons," and also as "wild bovines." In the process, she suggests ways that we might re-envision our relationship with nature.

Part II: Politics, Organized Activism, and Personal Encounters

Section I. Foundations: Community and Politics

After describing a factory farm and introducing readers to the indigenous Malaysian Dayak people, displaced (along with rainforests and wildlife) by the voracious palm oil industry, Debra Erenberg suggests that we look to the International Declaration of Human Rights as one possible avenue for bringing much-needed change. Charlotte Laws points to the giant pink elephant in the middle of Congress—democracy is a government by and for *people*—blatantly humanocentric—and outlines a utilitarian "omniocracy," essential to the cause of both earth and animal activists. Daniel Kirjner, Jennifer Gross, Nathan Baillet, and I explore connections between environmental degradation, consumption, and reproduction.

Section II. Bringing Change: Activists and NGOs

This section features activists who simultaneously work to liberate earth and animals, demonstrating both the common sense and the effectiveness of an integrated approach. Four members of the Raincoast Conservation Foundation discover—and successfully capitalize on—the power of ethics, economics, and human compassion to protect bears and ecosystems. Haida Bolton, who founded a youth camp in Uganda, explains how the camp helps local youth to foster environmental values and respect for wildlife. Employed by a Malaysian environmental organization, Phaik Kee Lim describes her work educating the public and pressuring businesses and governments around the world on behalf of penguins, coral reefs, snakes, freshwater reserves, and orangutans.

Section III. Bringing Change: Personal Encounters and Reflections

The final section explores personal journeys that exemplify the interrelated nature of earth and animal activism. Bethany Dopp, who took a zoo internship at ZooMontana, walks readers through zoo facilities, exposing what goes on behind closed doors, and explaining how this experience led her to question zoo ethics, particularly caging carnivores. Scientist and social justice advocate, environmentalist and animal activist, Xylem Galadhon clarifies how seemingly contradictory causes and interests support a complete, harmonious, and meaningful life. Deric Shannon describes his winding path from Marx and anarchy through feminism to holistic revolution, which ultimately forced him to engage with both earth and animal liberation—however reluctantly.

Note on Word Choice

Environmentalists tend to use the words anthropocentric, human-centered, humanocentric, or human chauvinism to reference attitudes that hold humans above other aspects of the natural world. Animal advocates tend to use the term "speciesism" to reference attitudes that elevate human beings over other species. These terms, used interchangeably, are particularly important in this anthology because the rejection of anthropocentric/humanocentric/speciesist attitudes are foundational to both earth and animal liberation. Moreover, no other social justice cause shares this core concern.

This anthology attempts to make visible and also to reverse speciesist/humanocentric linguistic habits. For example, the English language most often refers to nonhumans as if they were things rather than individuals. For example, we might say, "the dog that chased the ball was black." I have tried to note these conventions, and change "that" to "who": "The dog *who* chased the ball was black."

People also tend to refer to nonhuman animals as "it" or sometimes as "he"—regardless of an individual's sex. Inasmuch as we do not refer to human animals as "it," we ought not to refer to other animals as "it." Almost all species include males and females (among other karyotypes). A one-sex-fits-all vocabulary objectifies cattle and dogs and pigmy lemurs, denying their individuality. Where animal agriculture is concerned, this tendency obscures the truth—obviously the egg and dairy industry exploits only female animals to collect their nursing milk and reproductive eggs.

Moreover, "animal" includes humans: We are animals, mammals, primates. Therefore, I have encouraged authors to use the more cumbersome but correct "nonhuman animal" or "other animals"—except when "animal" is used in conjunction with a second word, such as "animal liberation," "animal welfare," "wild animal," "animal advocate," "animal testing," and so on. And there is no such creature as a "farm animal"—except human beings, who have spent considerable time farming down through history. Other species, such as turkeys and pigs, are *exploited* on farms, by humans. As such, they are "farmed" animals. Similarly, there is no such thing as a "veal calf" or a "lab animal," though there are millions of calves and mice who are systematically exploited by ranchers, researchers, and consumers. "Seafood" also disguises the truth—sea creatures are individuals who happen to be exploited by some humans for profit and the pleasure of the palate, and should not be defined by their eatability any more than should any other creature: We are all eatable, it is just a matter of who might eat us—large mammals such as bears and sharks, for example, or microbes and worms.

Finally, many animal activists and environmentalists use the term "breeding" to refer to human reproduction. This is an appropriate application, inasmuch as we use "breeding" to refer to reproduction in animals—given that we are animals.

But among such activists, "breeding" is too often applied only to women, thereby using the term in a sexist manner, without mention of men. As a matter of clarity, justice, and appropriate application, "breeding" ought to be applied to all who breed—bovines and fishes, women and men.

Note

Many authors in this anthology are busy activists; some come to English as a second (or third) language. I often worked extensively with authors to create essays for anthologies, offering their voices to readers while keeping their hands as free as possible to continue their work on behalf of earth and animals.

References

Blaney, B., 2012. *Big Bend Ranch State Park Burro-Killing Policy Suspended in Texas.* [Online] Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/20/big-bend-ranch-state-park-burros_n_1366863.html [Accessed 19 December 2012].

Daily World, 2012. *No Halt to Sea Lion Killing.* [Online] Available at: http://thedailyworld.com/sections/newswire/northwest/federal-judge-says-no-halt-sea-lion-killing.html [Accessed 23 January 2013].

Humane Society of the United States, 2012. *Texas Suspends Killing of Ferral Burros in Park.* [Online] Available at: http://hsus.typepad.com/wayne/2012/03/texas-burros.html [Accessed 06 June 2012].

Jonsson, K., 2012. *Straight From the Horse's Heart: Wild Burro Protection League-Texans Protest Wild Burro Endangerment.* [Online] Available at: http://rtfitchauthor.com/tag/wild-burro-protection-league/ [Accessed 20 May 2013].

Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2008. *Columbia River History: Salmon and Steelhead.* [Online] Available at: http://www.nwcouncil.org/history/salmonandsteelhead.asp [Accessed 23 January 2013].

Noske, B., 2007. Ethics and Animal Protection: Human-Animal Kinship for Animal Rightists and Deep Greens. In: M. Bekoff, ed. *Encyclopedia of Human-Animal Relationships: A Global Exploration of our Connections with Animals.* Westport: Greenwood Press, pp. 762–769.

Sagoff, M., 2012. Do We Consume Too Much?. In: D. Schmitdz and E. Willott, eds *Environmental Ethics: What Really Matters, What Really Works.* New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 302–323.

Scharrer, G., 2012. *Houston Chronicle: Fans Protest Wild Donkeys Being Killed at Big Bend Park.* [Online] Available at: http://www.chron.com/news/houston-texas/article/Protesters-deliver-petitions-on-donkeys-2616000.php [Accessed 20 May 2013].

Specie, E., n.d. *Endangered Species in Oregon.* [Online] Available at: http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/pub/stateListingAndOccurrenceIndividual.jsp?state=OR&s8fid=112761032792&s8fid=112762573902 [Accessed 23 January 2013].

Texas Parks and Wildlife, n.d. *Facts About Feral Burros at Big Bend Ranch State Park.* [Online] Available at: http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/burros/ [Accessed 06 June 2012].

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, n.d. *Species: Pacific Salmon (Oncorhynchus Spp).* [Online] Available at: http://www.fws.gov/species/species_accounts/bio_salm.html[Accessed 23 January 2013].

Waldau, P., 2011. *Animal Rights: What Everyone Needs to Know.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, n.d. *Columbia River Sea Lion Management.* [Online] Available at: http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/sealions/questions.html [Accessed 6 June 2012].